

OPINION 1840

Bagrus hoevenii Bleeker, 1846 (currently *Hemibagrus hoevenii*; Osteichthyes, Siluriformes): neotype designated

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Osteichthyes; Siluriformes; catfish; *Hemibagrus hoevenii*.

Ruling

(1) Under the plenary powers all previous fixations of type specimens for the nominal species *Bagrus hoevenii* Bleeker, 1846 are hereby set aside and specimen no. ZRC 37472 in the Zoological Reference Collection at the Department of Zoology, National University of Singapore, is designated as the neotype.

(2) The name *hoevenii* Bleeker, 1846, as published in the binomen *Bagrus hoevenii* and as defined by the neotype designated in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

History of Case 2934

An application for the designation of a neotype for *Bagrus hoevenii* Bleeker, 1846 was received from Dr Maurice Kottelat (*Cornol, Switzerland*) and Dr Kelvin K.P. Lim & Dr Peter K.L. Ng (*National University of Singapore, Republic of Singapore*) on 11 April 1994. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 51: 320–322 (December 1994). Notice of the case was sent to appropriate journals.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 1995 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 51: 322. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 1996 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes — 22: Bayer, Bock, Cocks, Cogger, Corliss, Hahn, Halvorsen, Hoppell, Kabata, Kraus, Lehtinen, Macpherson, Mahmert, Martins de Souza, Minelli, Nielsen, Nye, Ride, Savage, Starobogatov, Štys, Trjapitzin

Negative votes — 4: Bouchet, Dupuis, Holthuis and Schuster.

Bouchet commented: 'The authors of the application have demonstrated that Bleeker's material in Leiden is a mixture of non-type and possibly-type specimens, of several species of *Bagrus* including *hoevenii*, and probably of specimens from Java, Sumatra and Borneo. I approve their decision to designate a neotype to stabilize the name *Bagrus hoevenii*. However, for the designation to be convincing, evidence should be given that the neotype is conspecific with Bleeker's original concept of *hoevenii*, based on his description and type locality. This might be the case with their neotype from Peninsular Malaysia, but I am disturbed by the statement (para. 5 of the application) that the authors 'have been unable to find recent specimens from Java (the type locality) referable to *B. hoevenii*'. This could indicate that *B. hoevenii* has become extinct on Java and that their neotype designation is the best course of action to stabilize the name, or it could mean that their '*hoevenii*' from Peninsular Malaysia is not conspecific with Bleeker's original *hoevenii*. Until this point is discussed I find it appropriate to vote against the proposed neotype designation'.

Dupuis also voted against because the proposed neotype was not from Java. Holthuis commented: 'As the type locality of *Bagrus hoevenii* Bleeker, 1846 is Java, and as later material identified by Bleeker as this species came from Sumatra and Borneo, it seems illogical to designate a specimen from outside these three localities as the neotype. As *B. hoevenii* is 'an economically important catfish' it should not have been difficult to obtain a specimen from Java. If this proved to be impossible I would have preferred a specimen examined and illustrated by Bleeker to be the neotype, provided that this specimen was in a sufficiently good condition'.

Original reference

The following is the original reference to the name placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

hoevenii, *Bagrus*, Bleeker, 1846, *Natuur- en Geneeskundig Archief voor Néerland's Indië*, 3(2): 154.